

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/936,111	COLLINA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Caixia Lu	1713

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Caixia Lu. (3) Song Cheng.

(2) William Reid. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 04 March 2004.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: all.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representatives indicated that, in the inventive example 1, the polymer supported catalyst has higher activity and produces polymer with higher branching index compared with comparative example 2. However, the polymerizations for example 1 and comparative example 2 were not conducted under the same condition, example 1 in gas phase and comparative example 2 in slurry. Therefore, applicants are advised to provide further evidence to show unexpected results.